

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 09/780,642 02/09/2001 Daniel Pettigrew G&C 30566.136-US-01 6386 EXAMINER 22462 7590 09/27/2004 WU, JINGGE **GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER** ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045 2623

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/780,64		PETTIGREW ET AL.		
		Examiner		Art Unit		
		Jingge W	ı	2623		
	The MAILING DATE of this communic			orrespondence ad	dress	
Period fo	· -			(O) 5D O · ·		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION in sions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) period for reply is specified above, the maximum stating to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no eve unication.) days, a reply within the state ututory period will apply and wi will, by statute, cause the apply	nt, however, may a reply be tir story minimum of thirty (30) day Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this cools () (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.	
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2004.						
· —	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.					
-,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)□	5)☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)☑ Claim(s) <u>1-8,10-18,20-28 and 30</u> is/are rejected.					
6)⊠						
7)	7)⊡ Claim(s) <u>9, 19, 29</u> is/are objected to.					
8)[8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers	•				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 2623

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response to the last Office Action, filed June 23, 2004 has been entered and made of record.

Applicants' amendment has required new grounds of rejection. New grounds rejection are therefore presented in the Office Action.

Remarks

Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21, and 30 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant argues that Takashima does not teach identifying a luminance range independently from identifying a color vector by a user because Takashima only mentions identifying a color vector (a characteristic curve of a color signal) which include modification of the black and white level.

Examiner disagrees. In fact, Takashima expressly mentions that image correction (modifying) means for determining the characteristic curve (color vector) through inputting black level and white level (luminance range) by a user (col. 16 line 66-col. 17 line 25).

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: There is no support in the specification that expressly mention identifying luminance range "independently" from identifying the color vector.

Art Unit: 2623

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 10-11, 20-21, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for identifying luminance range and color vector, does not reasonably provide enablement for identifying luminance range independently from identifying the color vector. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to fully understand the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. As illustrated in figs. 6-8, and corresponding explanation in the specification (page 10-13), the color vector and luminance range are in the one coordination system and luminance range can determine the color correction of color vector. There is only dependant relationship in fig. 6, no independence of each other.

Claims 2-8, 12-19, and 22-29 depend from 1, 11, and 21, respectively are, thus, rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 2623

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20-28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6504551 to Takashima et al.

As to claim 1 (as best understanding of the Examiner), Takashima discloses

Apparatus for processing image data comprising:

storage means for storing instructions (fig. 1 12);

memory means for storing the instructions during execution and for storing image data (fig. 1 13);

processing means (fig. 1, 11) and display means (fig. 1, 14) for allow user to interact and modify the color values, wherein,

identifying, through input from a user, a color vector (Pi) and luminance range (BL and WL) for said color vector (fig. 3a, col. 16 lines 31-52), wherein said luminance range is identified by the user independently from the identifying of the color vector (col. 16 line 66-col. 17 line 25);

Art Unit: 2623

defining a color vector function (equation 1) in response to said identifying (col. 17, lines 5-32);

modifying colors in response to the luminance values with reference to the color vector function (fig. 2-fig. 3B, col. 16 line 66-col. 17 line 35).

As to claims 2-3, Takashima further discloses the color vector function is defined by points on curves and is animated ((fig. 3A, L1 and L2, note that users can move, change, and operate on the curves).

As to claim 4, Takashima further discloses the color vector function is defined by applying the identified color vector to a previously defined color vector function (fig. 3A-B, col. 16 line 31-col. 17 line 32).

As to claim 5, Takashima further discloses LUT (fig. 2, col. 15 line 46-col. 16 line 16).

As to claim 6, Takashima further discloses the color vector function defines red, green blue displacement with reference to coordinates (col. 15 line 46-col. 16 line 16, col. 24 lines 19-52).

As to claim 7, Takashima further discloses a user performs operations to control the image processing with a GUI on a monitor, the interface including a plurality of widgets for facilitating user communication with the processes for modifying color values (fig. 1, 3A, 40-43).

As to claim 8, Takashima further discloses the identification of a color vector (Pi) is performed with reference to a user input of coordinates from a two dimensional trackball widget (mouse) which dimensions are pure color (fig. 3A-B, col. 16 line 31-col. 17 line 32).

Art Unit: 2623

As to claims 10, 11-18, 20, 21-28 an 30, the limitations are addressed with regard to claim 1-9, (note that updating the color vector function is inherent when user either choosing other Ps or inputting luminance ranges).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9, 19, and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2623

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Jingge Wu whose telephone number is (703) 308-9588. He can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm. The examiner can be also reached on second alternate Fridays.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to TC customer service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au, can be reached at (703) 308-6604.

The Working Group Fax number is (703) 872-9314.

Jingge/Wu

Primary Patent Examiner